



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/197,314 11/20/98 KRISHNAMACHARI

S PHA-23.543

EXAMINER

WM01/0131

LAURIE E GATHMAN
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD
TARRYTOWN NY 10591

LEE, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED:

01/31/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/197,314

Applicant(s)
Krishnamachari

Examiner
Richard Lee

Group Art Unit
2613



- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2613

1. The Examiner wants to point out that the U.S. application serial numbers 09/062,940, 09/062,939, and 09/094,828 as cited on the PTO-1449 IDS filed November 20, 1998 has not been considered by the Examiner since the U.S. applications are not publications. A line has been drawn through the citations on the IDS filed November 20, 1998 accordingly. In addition, it is noted that such U.S. application serial numbers are cited in numerous areas in the Specification of the present application but it is unsure whether the applicant would want such information disclosed to the public in the event that the current application becomes a patent before the related applications cited in the present Specification is/are to be issued. It is suggested for the applicant in the future at least to provide any co-related U. S. application(s) in a separate communication to the Office instead of citing the application(s) on an IDS.
2. The drawings are objected to because references to blocks "70" to "75" as shown at page 19, lines 9-13 of the Specification for Figures 13-16 have not been identified in the respective figures. Correction is required.
3. Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect can be deferred until the application is allowed by the examiner.

Art Unit: 2613

4. Claims 5, 8-10, 18, 21-23, 31, 34-36, 45, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The particular claim to the MPEG, MPEG-1, MPEG-2, and MPEG-4 recommendations as shown in the respective claims 5, 8, 18, 21, 31, 34, 45, and 46 is indefinite because there are many versions of the MPEG recommendations and the recommends are continuously updated. The scope of the claim limitations cannot change over time, and unless the specification states the specific MPEG versions with the dates or a copies of the MPEG recommendations are provided, the claims are indefinite.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-6, 11-19, 24-26, 40, 45, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ueno et al (5,418,570).

Ueno et al discloses a motion picture coding apparatus as shown in Figures 1, 7, 13, 15, and 18-21, and the same apparatus, method, and computer executable process steps stored on a computer readable medium, the computer executable process steps to increase a resolution of at least a portion of a reference frame of video (see 35 of Figure 13, 60 of Figure 15), the apparatus, method, and computer executable process comprising the same selecting a first block of pixels in

Art Unit: 2613

the reference frame (see columns 1-2, column 15, lines 33-41, column 16, lines 8-20); locating in N target frames one or more blocks of pixels that substantially correspond to the first block of pixels, where the N target frames are separate from the reference frame (i.e., search range calculation within coding section 30 of Figure 13, see column 15, lines 33-41); determining values of additional pixels based on values of pixels in the first block and on values of pixels in the one or more blocks, adding the additional pixels among the pixels in the first block, determining the values of the additional pixels based also on coefficients which are weighted in accordance with the first block and the one or more blocks, wherein the coefficients are weighted based on differences between pixels in the first block and pixels in each of the one or more blocks, wherein the differences comprise an MPEG residual (i.e., 35 of Figure 13, 60 of Figure 15, Figures 18-21, and see columns 1-2, columns 7-8, columns 15-16, columns 19-21); wherein the N target frames comprise frames of video which were predicted at least in part based on pixels in the reference frame (see column 16, lines 8-20); wherein in a case that the locating step does not locate any blocks of pixels in the target frames that substantially correspond to the first block of pixels, the determining step determines the values of the additional pixels based on values of pixels in the first block without regard to values of pixels in the N target frames (i.e., I frame processing, see column 2, lines 31-39); changing distances between pixels in the first block in order to change a size of the first block (see Figures 18-21, column 19-21); wherein the locating step uses motion vectors from the reference frame to the target frame to locate the one or more blocks of pixels and searches through the N target frames to locate the one or more blocks of pixels (see column

Art Unit: 2613

15, lines 33-41); and wherein in a case that the reference and target frames of video are coded using MPEG, the locating step locates one or more blocks using motion vectors present in an MPEG bitstream for target frames and wherein the coefficients are determined using DCT values of at least one coded residual, where the at least one coded residual comprises differences between the reference frame and the target frames (see column 15, lines 33-41, column 20, lines 54-68, Figures 13, 15, 18-21).

7. Claims 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yonemitsu et al (5,475,435).

Yonemitsu et al discloses a layer encoding and decoding apparatus as shown in Figures 1 and 2, and the same television system which receives coded video data (see column 1 and Figure 2), and which forms images based on the coded video data, the television system comprising a decoder (see Figure 2) which decodes the video data to produce frames of video; a processor (55, 57 of Figure 2) which increases a resolution of a reference frame of video based on pixels in the reference frame and based on pixels in at least one other target frame of the video, wherein the processor increases the resolution of the reference frame by selecting blocks of pixels in the reference frame and for each selected block, locating in N target frames one or more blocks of pixels that substantially correspond to the first block of pixels, where the N target frames are separate from the reference frame (see column 6, line 34 to column 7, line 7, line 63), and determining values of additional pixels based on values of pixels in the selected block and on values of pixels in the one or more blocks and adding the additional pixels among the pixels in the

Art Unit: 2613

selected block (i.e., interpolation within upsampling circuit 57 of Figure 2); a display which displays an image based on the reference frame (see column 1 and Figure 2); and wherein in a case that the processor does not locate any blocks of pixels in the target frames that substantially correspond to the selected block of pixels, the processor determines the values of the additional pixels based on values of pixels in the selected block without regard to values of pixels in the N target frames (i.e., I frame processing as determined from the macroblock type signal, see column 2, lines 55-62, column 6, lines 34-44).

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 8-10 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueno et al (5,418,570).

Ueno et al discloses substantially the same apparatus, method, and computer executable process steps as above, further including wherein the reference frame of video and the N target frames are coded using one of MPEG-1 and MPEG-2 (see column 1); wherein the reference frame comprises a B frame, and wherein before the selecting step, the step of determining a location of the first block in the reference frame based on blocks of pixels in frames which precede and which follow the reference frame (i.e., bidirectional prediction, see column 16, lines 8-20); and wherein the reference frame comprises one of an I frame and P frame, and wherein the N

Art Unit: 2613

target frames comprise at least one of a P frame and a bi-directional frame (see column 2, lines 31-39, column 16, lines 8-20).

Ueno et al does not particularly disclose, though, conformance with the MPEG-4 standard as claimed in claims 8 and 21. However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that the MPEG-4 recommend standard is old and well recognized in the art, and that such MPEG-4 conformance may certainly be provided for the video image processing system of Ueno et al in order to provide the same compatibility and conformance as desired.

10. Claims 7 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueno et al as applied to claims 1-6, 11-19, 24-26, 40, 45, and 46 in the above paragraph (6), and further in view of Guetz et al (6,091,777).

Ueno et al discloses substantially the same apparatus, method, and computer executable process steps as above, but does not particularly disclose determining the values of the additional pixels by performing bilinear interpolation using at least some of the pixels in the first block as claimed in claims 7 and 20. However, Guetz et al discloses a continuously adaptive digital video compression system and teaches the conventional use of bilinear interpolation associated with motion estimation of blocks (see column 2, lines 23-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the Ueno et al and Guetz et al references in front of him/her and the general knowledge of the interpolation of images, would have had no difficulty in providing the bilinear interpolation of image data as taught by Guetz et al as part of the motion

Art Unit: 2613

estimation of pixel data within the system of Ueno et al for the same well known image interpolation purposes as claimed.

11. Claims 27-32, 34-39, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueno et al as applied to claims 1-6, 8-19, 21-26, 40, 45, and 46 in the above paragraphs (6) and (9), and further in view of Lempel (6,163,576).

Ueno et al discloses substantially the same apparatus, method, and computer executable process steps as above, but does not particularly a memory which stores computer executable process steps. However, Lempel discloses a video encoder having reduced memory bandwidth requirements, and teaches the conventional use of a CPU 202 of Figure 2 for storing and executing computer processes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the Ueno et al and Lempel references in front of him/her, would have had no difficulty in providing the computer memory storage of executable processes as taught by Lempel for the video image processing system of Ueno et al for the same well known purposes as claimed.

12. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ueno et al and Lempel as applied to claims 1-6, 8-19, 21-32, 34-39, 40, and 45-47 in the above paragraphs (6) and (11), and further in view of Guetz et al(6,091,777).

The combination of Ueno et al and Lempel discloses substantially the same apparatus, method, and computer executable process steps as above, but does not particularly disclose determining the values of the additional pixels by performing bilinear interpolation using at least

Art Unit: 2613

some of the pixels in the first block as claimed in claim 33. However, Guetz et al discloses a continuously adaptive digital video compression system and teaches the conventional use of bilinear interpolation associated with motion estimation of blocks (see column 2, lines 23-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the Ueno et al, Lempel, and Guetz et al references in front of him/her and the general knowledge of the interpolation of images, would have had no difficulty in providing the bilinear interpolation of image data as taught by Guetz et al as part of the motion estimation of pixel data within the system of Ueno et al for the same well known image interpolation purposes as claimed.

13. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonemitsu et al as applied to claims 41-43 in the above paragraph (7), and further in view of Song et al (6,115,070).

Yonemitsu et al discloses substantially the same television system as above, but does not particularly disclose wherein the decoder and the processor are implemented in a settop box as claimed in claim 44. Such decoder and processing within a settop box is however old and well recognized in the art, as exemplified by Song et al (See Figure 24 and column 24, line 64 to column 25, line 18. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the Yonemitsu et al and Song et al references in front of him/her and the general knowledge of settop box functions, would have had no difficulty in providing the settop box with decoder and processing capabilities as taught by Song et al for the video image system of Yonemitsu et al for the same well known MPEG compliant decoding purposes as claimed.

Art Unit: 2613

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gonzales et al, Sezan et al, Takahashi et al, Astle, Hekstra et al, Ueda et al, and Sitnik disclose various types of encoding systems.

15. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-6306 (for informal or draft communications, please label


"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2613

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard Lee whose telephone number is (703) 308-6612.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.


RICHARD LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Richard Lee/rl

1/26/01

